<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">**Meeting Highlights**</td><td colspan="2">**System Development Life Cycle (SDLC) Workgroup Meeting**</td></tr>
</table>

Meeting Highlights	**System Development Life Cycle (SDLC) Workgroup Meeting**	
	DAY: Tuesday, August 11, 2010 **TIME:** 8:30AM-10:30M **LOCATION:** Department of Insurance (Dobbs Building, 430 N Salisbury Street, Raleigh, Conference Room 2238) or Dial-In 919-420-1378	

Meeting Called By:	SDLC Workgroup Members
Meeting Purpose:	Prepare work group charter and organize to position the group to move forward.
Attendees:	Chris Cline, Community Colleges Beau Garcia, Department of Insurance Paul Jarmul, Department of Revenue Ronda Jones, Department of Public Instruction Ann Tyndall, Department of Public Instruction LaQuita Hudson, Information Technology Services Linda Lowe, Statewide Enterprise Project Management Office Gaye Mays, Statewide Enterprise Project Management Office Cheryl Ritter, Department of Transportation Sreenadha Vaka, Department of Health & Human Services

Agenda Topics Discussed

1. Welcome – Beau greeting everyone. Sreenadha Vaka joined the meeting via the meet-me number. LaQuita Hudson attended and is replacing Dimple Katira on the team. Ronda Jones invited Ann Tyndall to the meeting to discuss the Consolidated Federal Data Reporting project from an Agile perspective.

2. Infrastructure project – Beau Garcia provided the details of the DPI – School Connectivity project he managed while at DPI. Beau noted he began managing the project after the project had already begun. The project had been started as a planning project at the Friday Institute. Beau noted several challenges on the project.

   A) While the scope of the project never changed, the details of the project had to be defined. The purpose of the project was to provide a common backbone to School Districts but challenges came about because of how school districts were contracting with local telecoms.

   B) Some of the school districts did not connect at the main Central Office site. This is due to several situations of local collaboration OR the issues that some city school districts are within the county.

   C) Issues also came with billing and reimbursement of connectivity costs. Bill codes kept changing, which was a challenge with reimbursement. John Belk, Jeannette Evans, Kris Knower and John Mcshane were spot on with their support in getting this resolved in short order for DPI. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) were also using sole source contracts and this project provided a procurement solution that allowed LEAs to obtain lower costs based on contract work from ITS. So, even though there were good things that came out of the contract, there was a shift from the way that LEAs were doing business.

   Beau noted that the Friday Institute completed the Planning project and therefore enabled the Connectivity project to move through Initiation rather easily.

Beau noted Planning & Design and Execute & Build phases were challenges because EPMO asked for O&M to be taken out and then added back.

ITS did a good job of providing competition among the telecoms and the LEAs were able to receive a solution but at lower prices. The ISP contracts were competed as commodities between vendors who were able to provide services to all the LEAs.

The project duration was approximately 11 months. Beau noted this was a successful project because the contract provided a cheaper solution for the LEAs and a majority of the LEAs increased available bandwidth by more than 50%.

The major challenges were the coordination of OSBM, the EPMO (QA team), and the PMA. However, ITS (Mark Cooke, etc.) helped a lot with the RFP and providing lower costs to the LEAs.

The question that came out of the discussion was whether OSBM and EPMO could post which agencies they support.

3. Agile development – Ronda Jones provided details of the Consolidated Federal Data Reporting project at DPI. She also invited Ann Tyndall to the meeting to discuss the agile perspective of the project. One of the goals of the project is to consolidate the reports into a project. The PMA requested the reports be consolidated into a project. Ann noted one of the issues with the project is that the overall project is at the Initiation phase; however, the reports are at different gates based on their completion rate. There was quite a bit of conversation on the reason these reports were combined to be a project. It was noted that the EPMO needs to assist and direct agencies on what constitutes a project in the PPM tool. The EPMO can also assist with the education of processes; however, the EPMO will not be able to tackle requirements that agency PMOs put in place on top of EPMO requirements. Paul asked if a kickoff meeting would bring people together to understand roles and responsibilities. Some agencies require a kickoff meeting and others do not.

4. Upcoming Meetings – We decided to meet the 2nd and 4th Wednesday of every month from 8:30AM-10:30AM at DOI (Dobbs Building Conference Room 2238). Gaye will re-send meeting notices to reflect.

5. Action Items:

   1) Linda – Ask if IT Procurement, OSBM and EPMO would post which resources were assigned to which agencies
   2) Gaye – Re-send meeting appointments for every 2nd and 4th Wednesday
   3) Chris – send meeting minutes along with the Project Coordination List.
   4) Arun – review infrastructure project at the next meeting
   5) Team – invite A&E team from ITS (but not the next meeting)
   6) Team – include on next agenda the discussion of pain points to get through gates
   7) Team – review the Charter
   8) Team – review the article that Gaye provided at the first meeting